

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 13 2006

REMARKS

The Office Action of 09/13/2006 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected as being unpatentable over Yukitomo in view of Offord. Claims 3 and 9 were rejected as being unpatentable over the same base combination further in view of Labedz. Claim 4 was rejected as being unpatentable over the same base combination further in view of Ueda. Claim 5, 7, 8, 11 and 12 were rejected as being unpatentable over the same base combination further in view of Smee. Claim 6 was rejected as being unpatentable over the same base combination further in view of Pukkila. Claim 10 was rejected as being unpatentable over the same base combination further in view of Roy. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, the rejection states in part:

Yukitomo fails to teach a coefficient adapter for adapting two or more of the sets of coefficients in a time shared manner. *Offord et al. (Offord teaches these features.... It would have been obvious...to modify Yukitomo with Offord time shared tap coefficients in order to optimize the equalizing tap coefficients.*

In fact, Offord does not teach or suggest those features absent from Yukitomo. What Offord teaches is a method of computing a *single set* of coefficients in such a way as to ensure adaptation to the best possible tap weighting coefficient vector. (Column 2, lines 15-24.) The term "time shared" is not used in Offord to refer to sharing of the tap weight processor between more than one filter. Rather, it is used to refer to the fact that, instead of updating each tap during each of N read events using 1/N of the read data, a single tap is updated during each read event using all of the data. (Column 4, lines 6-16).

Best Available Copy

In other words, the tap weight processor is time shared between taps of a single set of coefficients. It is not time shared between different sets of coefficients.

Hence it may be seen that there is no teaching or suggestion *in the references themselves* of a coefficient adapter for adapting two or more sets of coefficients for different adaptive equalizers in a time shared manner as claimed.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-11 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 12/13/2006

Best Available Copy